arXiv:1610.06012v2 [math.PR] 9 Dec 2016

Omnithermal Perfect Simulation for Multi-server Queues

Stephen B. Connor

13th December 2016

Abstract

A number of perfect simulation algorithms for multi-server First Come First Served queues have recently been developed. Those of Connor and Kendall (2015) and Blanchet, Pei, and Sigman (2015) use dominated Coupling from the Past (domCFTP) to sample from the equilibrium distribution of the Kiefer-Wolfowitz workload vector for stable $M/G/c$ and $GI/GI/c$ queues respectively, using random assignment queues as dominating processes. In this note we answer a question posed by Connor and Kendall (2015), by demonstrating how these algorithms may be modified in order to carry out domCFTP *simultaneously* for a range of values of c (the number of servers), at minimal extra cost.

Keywords and phrases:
Dominated Coupling from the Past; First Come First Served discipline [FCFS]; Kiefer-Wolfowitz workload vector; perfect simulation; M/G/c queue; Random Assignment discipline [RA]; sandwiching; stochastic ordering.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification:
Primary 65C05; Secondary 60K25; 60J05; 68U20

1 Introduction

During the past five years there have been a number of significant advances in perfect simulation methods for multi-server queues. Sigman (2011) pioneered the use of dominated Coupling from the Past (domCFTP) for "super-stable" $M/G/c$ queues with First Come First Served (FCFS) discipline. ("Super-stable" means that the queue would remain stable even if all but one of the c servers were removed.) The limitation to super-stable queues is necessitated by Sigman's use of a stable $M/G/1$ queue as dominating process in the domCFTP algorithm. Connor and Kendall (2015) subsequently showed how to generalise this idea to work for stable $M/G/c$ queues, by using as dominating process an $M/G/c$ queue with *random assignment* (RA) discipline (under which the c servers are independent). They describe two algorithms (outlined in Section 2 below) and compare their efficiency; they show that their Algorithm 1, which requires waiting for the dominating process to empty, is significantly less efficient than Algorithm 2, which makes use of sandwiching processes (in common with many other domCFTP algorithms).

Blanchet, Dong, and Pei (2015) were the first authors to show how to perform perfect simulation for multi-server queues with general inter-arrival time and service time distributions (i.e. relaxing the assumption of Exponential inter-arrival times). Rather than use a random assignment queue as dominating process, they make use of a so-called "vacation system".

(This idea is also employed by Blanchet and Chen (2016) to sample from the equilibrium of a generalized Jackson Network of single-server queues.) However, Blanchet et al. (2015) have since demonstrated how to make the random assignment dominating process work in this setting. The hard part here is working out how to simulate the dominating process in reverse-time; with renewal, as opposed to Poisson arrivals, the c servers in the RA model are no longer independent. These pieces of work all serve to demonstrate that perfect simulation is a practical and efficient method for simulating from a wide class of multi-server queueing systems.

Connor and Kendall (2015) ask a very natural question: is it possible to carry out dominated CFTP *simultaneously* for $M/G/c$ queues with a range of c, the number of servers? The authors refer to this as "omnithermal dominated CFTP", borrowing a term used to describe Grimmett (1995)'s coupling of random-cluster processes for all values of a specific parameter, and applied to CFTP in Propp and Wilson (1996). The potentially difficult issue in the queueing context is that of detecting a time at which we can be sure that the appropriate sandwiching processes will coalesce for all c in the range being considered. In this paper we show how such coalescence may be detected with the aid of a simple criterion that uses information about the sandwiching processes only for the queue with the least number of servers.

The outline of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we recall the definition of the Kiefer-Wolfowitz workload process associated to a multi-server FCFS queue, and then sketch the two perfect simulation algorithms of Connor and Kendall (2015). In Section 3 we present a natural partial order between Kiefer-Wolfowitz vectors of potentially different lengths; we subsequently use this to determine a condition which ensures that the termination time of Connor and Kendall (2015)'s Algorithm 2 is monotonic in the number of servers c. In Section 4 we use this condition to produce an Omnithermal Algorithm, and briefly report on the results of applying this to some $M/M/c$ queues. Finally, in Section 5, we indicate how our results may be used to perform omnithermal perfect simulation for queues with general renewal input, or in the situation where we are interested in scaling the distribution of service durations, rather than changing the number of servers.

2 Dominated CFTP for $M/G/c$ queues

Consider a general $\cdot/\cdot/c$ FCFS queue. We denote the Kiefer-Wolfowitz workload vector (Kiefer and Wolfowitz, 1955) at time $t \geq 0$ by $\mathbf{V}(t) = (V(1,t), V(2,t), \ldots, V(c,t))$, where $V(1,t) \leq V(2,t) \leq \ldots$ represent the ordered amounts of residual work in the system for the c servers at time t. Customer n arrives at time t_n (for $0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq \ldots$), with inter-arrival times denoted by $T_n = t_{n+1} - t_n$ (where we set $t_0 = 0$). Customer n brings with it a service duration S_n. Observing $\mathbf{V}$ just before arrival of the n^{th} customer (but definitely after the arrival of the $(n-1)^{\text{st}}$ customer) generates the process $\mathbf{W}_n$: in the case $t_{n-1} < t_n$ we have $\mathbf{W}_n = \mathbf{V}(t_n-)$. This satisfies the well-known recursion

$$\mathbf{W}_{n+1} \quad = \quad R(\mathbf{W}_n + S_n\mathbf{e} - T_n\mathbf{f})^+, \qquad \text{for } n \geq 0\,, \tag{1}$$

where $\mathbf{e} = (1,0,0,\ldots,0)$, $\mathbf{f} = (1,1,\ldots,1)$, R places the coordinates of a vector in increasing order, and $^+$ replaces negative coordinates of a vector by zeros.

For simplicity of exposition we shall primarily discuss $M/G/c$ queues in what follows (i.e. inter-arrival times are Exponential). However, our method for performing omnithermal

perfect simulation for these queues applies equally well to $GI/GI/c$ queues using an algorithm of Blanchet et al. (2015), as will be observed in Section 5. Let the arrival rate be $\lambda > 0$, and let service durations S_n be i.i.d. with mean $1/\mu$ and $\mathbb{E}\left[S^2\right] < \infty$. (As explained in Connor and Kendall (2015), this second moment condition is required in order to guarantee finite mean run-time of their perfect simulation algorithms.) The queue is stable if and only if $\lambda/(c\mu) < 1$, and so we restrict attention to this scenario.

Connor and Kendall (2015) propose two domCFTP algorithms for sampling from the equilibrium distribution of the Kiefer-Wolfowitz workload vector for a stable $M/G/c$ queue X. Both of these algorithms use as dominating process an $M/G/c$ queue Y with Random Assignment (RA) service discipline. That is, customers in Y are allocated upon arrival to a uniformly chosen server; this renders the c servers independent, which allows us to easily simulate a stationary version of the dominating process in reverse-time, as required by domCFTP. It is possible to arrange for X to be path-wise dominated by Y as long as the two queues are coupled by assigning service durations in order of *initiation of service*. (Under FCFS customers initiate service in the same order in which they arrive, but this is typically not the case for other service disciplines.) The precise statement of this domination can be found in Connor and Kendall (2015), an abridged version of which is reproduced here for convenience.

Theorem 1 (Theorem 3.3 of Connor and Kendall (2015))**.** *Consider a c-server queueing system viewed as a function of (a) the sequence of arrival times $0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq t_3 \leq \ldots$ and (b) the sequence of service durations $S_1, S_2, S_3, \ldots$ assigned in order of initiation of service. Consider the following different allocation rules, in some cases varying over time:*

1. *$\cdot/\cdot/c\,[RA]$;*
2. *$\cdot/\cdot/c\,[RA]$ until a specified non-random time T, then switching to $\cdot/\cdot/c\,[FCFS]$;*
3. *$\cdot/\cdot/c\,[RA]$ until a specified non-random time T', $0 \leq T' \leq T$, then switching to $\cdot/\cdot/c\,[FCFS]$;*
4. *$\cdot/\cdot/c\,[FCFS]$;*

Then case k dominates case $k+1$, in the sense that the m^{th} initiation of service in case $k+1$ occurs no later than the m^{th} initiation of service in case k, and the m^{th} departure in case $k+1$ occurs no later than the m^{th} departure in case k. Moreover, for all times $t \geq T'$ the Kiefer-Wolfowitz workload vector for case 3 dominates (coordinate-by-coordinate) that of case 4, with similar domination holding for cases 2 and 3 for all $t \geq T$.

We can now summarise the two domCFTP algorithms of Connor and Kendall (2015).

Algorithm 1

1. Construct a stationary $M/G/c\,[RA]$ process backwards in time until it empties at some time $T^* < 0$;
2. Use this to create a forwards in time trajectory of an $M/G/c\,[RA]$ queue Y started from empty at time T^*;
3. Use the sequences of arrival times and service durations in Y to construct an $M/G/c\,[FCFS]$ queue X that is dominated by Y over $[T^*, 0]$;
4. Return X_0.

Algorithm 2

1. Fix a *backoff* (or *inspection*) time $T < 0$, and construct a path of the stationary $M/G/c\,[RA]$ queue Y over the time period $[T, 0]$;
2. Construct *sandwiching processes* L^c and U^c over $[T, 0]$ as follows:
   (a) L^c and U^c both evolve as the Kiefer-Wolfowitz vectors of $M/G/c\,[FCFS]$ queues, using the same sequences of arrival times and service durations as Y over $(T, 0]$;
   (b) L^c_T is empty, while U^c_T is instantiated using the same residual workloads present in Y_T;
3. Check for coalescence: if $L^c_0 = U^c_0$ return this value; else set $T \leftarrow 2T$ and return to Step 1.

Connor and Kendall (2015) provide more details for each of the steps outlined above, and demonstrate that Algorithm 2, although more complicated to describe, is in general significantly faster than Algorithm 1.

3 Omnithermal perfect simulation

In this section we consider the following question: is it possible to adapt the domCFTP algorithms outlined in Section 2 in order to *simultaneously* sample from the equilibrium of $M/G/(c + m)$ queues, where m ranges over some subset of $\mathbb{N}$? As pointed out by Connor and Kendall (2015), it is straightforward to accomplish this in a relatively efficient manner using Algorithm 1: once an emptying time T^* has been established for the $M/G/c$ queue, then all $M/G/(c + m)$ queues of interest can be started from empty at this time and run over $[T^*, 0]$ using the same arrival times and service durations; a simple workload domination argument shows that their values at time 0 will form a single perfect sample from the required set of equilibrium distributions. However, given the significantly faster run-time of Algorithm 2, a far more interesting question is whether or not one can produce a comparably efficient omnithermal domCFTP algorithm using sandwiching processes.

Suppose that we have implemented Algorithm 2, and have obtained one equilibrium sample for the $M/G/c$ queue. That is, we have established some backoff time $T < 0$, along with sequences of arrival times and service durations, such that $L^c_0 = U^c_0$. Our first observation is the following: suppose that we use these sequences to produce new FCFS processes L^{c+m} and U^{c+m} over $[T, 0]$ in the manner described in step 2 of Algorithm 2. (That is, L^{c+m}_T is empty, and U^{c+m}_T contains the residual workloads present in Y_T, the $M/G/c$ $[RA]$ process.) Then the workload vector for U^{c+m}_t dominates (coordinate-by-coordinate) that of L^{c+m}_t for all $t \in [T, 0]$, and if $L^{c+m}_0 = U^{c+m}_0$ then this value will be a perfect draw from the equilibrium of the $M/G/(c + m)$ queue, as required. This follows from Theorem 1: due to the way in which it is instantiated, U^{c+m} is a queueing system that changes from $M/G/c\,[RA]$ to $M/G/(c+m)\,[FCFS]$ at time T. But the former of these can be thought of as an $M/G/(c+m)$ system with a random allocation rule that uniformly distributes jobs amongst only c of the $(c + m)$ servers; since this is less efficient than the FCFS discipline, the proof of Theorem 3.3 in Connor and Kendall (2015) holds with this slightly modified setup.

This observation implies that, given the arrival times and service durations used in Algorithm 2 with c servers, we could just construct sandwiching processes L^{c+m} and U^{c+m} over $[T, 0]$ and see whether they coalesce. If they do, then we have obtained a sample from the

required distribution; if not, then we need to extend the dominating process Y for this sample further into the past (setting $T \leftarrow 2T$), and then check again for coalescence. But this method is not as clean as we would like: in particular, it is likely that the extent to which any single sample path of Y needs to be extended will vary with the value of m. (As will be shown in the next section, coalescence of L^{c+m} and U^{c+m} over $[T, 0]$ does not imply coalescence of L^{c+n} and U^{c+n} over the same interval for all $n > m$.) Assuming that we want to obtain samples for a range of values of $m \in \mathbb{N}$, this method is therefore rather inefficient. Ideally we would like to use Algorithm 2 to produce a sample for the $M/G/c$ queue, and then re-use the path of Y for this sample in order to draw from the equilibrium of $M/G/(c+m)$ for any desired $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

3.1 Comparing queues with different numbers of servers

Suppose that we have two FCFS queues, each seeing the same set of arrival times and associated service durations. We first of all need to show that the workload vector with fewer servers dominates that of the other, with respect to a certain natural partial order.

Definition 2. For $V^c \in \mathbb{R}^c$ and $V^{c+m} \in \mathbb{R}^{c+m}$, we write $V^{c+m} \preceq V^c$ if and only if

$$V^{c+m}(k+m) \leq V^c(k)\,, \quad k = 1, \ldots, c\,.$$

Thus if V^c and V^{c+m} are workload vectors, $V^{c+m} \preceq V^c$ if and only if each of the c busiest servers in V^{c+m} has no more work remaining than the corresponding server in V^c.

Proposition 3. *Let V^c and V^{c+m} be Kiefer-Wolfowitz workload vectors for an $M/G/c$ and an $M/G/(c+m)$ FCFS queue respectively. Suppose that $V_0^{c+m} \preceq V_0^c$ and that each queue sees the same set of arrival times and associated service durations. Then $V_t^{c+m} \preceq V_t^c$ for all $t \geq 0$.*

Proof. It is clear that the ordering between V^c and V^{c+m} will hold until the first arrival time, t_1. Furthermore, once we show that $V_{t_1}^{c+m} \preceq V_{t_1}^c$ the result will follow simply by induction.

Let S denote the service duration attached to the arrival at time t_1. Recall that the effect of this arrival is that S is added to any outstanding work at the first (least busy) coordinate in V^c and V^{c+m}, and then the resulting vectors are each reordered in increasing order. Suppose that after this reordering has taken place, the coordinate with value $S + V_{t_1-}^c(1)$ (the amount of work now at the server to which the arrival at t_1 was allocated) is located in position i^c of $V_{t_1}^c$, etc.

If $i^{c+m} \leq m$ then the result is trivial (since the last c coordinates of V^{c+m} are unchanged by the arrival at time t_1). So suppose that $i^{c+m} > m$. Then for $k < \min\{i^c, i^{c+m} - m\}$ we have

$$V_{t_1}^{c+m}(k+m) = V_{t_1-}^{c+m}(k+m+1) \leq V_{t_1-}^c(k+1) = V_{t_1}^c(k)\,.$$

Similarly, for $k > \max\{i^c, i^{c+m} - m\}$ we have

$$V_{t_1}^{c+m}(k+m) = V_{t_1-}^{c+1}(k+m) \leq V_{t_1-}^c(k) = V_{t_1}^c(k)\,.$$

There are now two cases to consider, depending on which of i^c and $i^{c+m} - m$ is larger.

Case 1: $i^c \leq i^{c+m} - m$. Then for $k = i^c, \ldots, i^{c+m} - m$:

$$V_{t_1}^{c+m}(k+m) \leq V_{t_1}^{c+m}(i^{c+m}) = V_{t_1-}^{c+m}(1) + S \leq V_{t_1-}^c(1) + S = V_{t_1}^c(i^c) \leq V_{t_1}^c(k)\,.$$

Here the first and last inequalities hold since the coordinates of the workload vectors at time t_1 are arranged in increasing order; the middle inequality follows from $V_{t_1-}^{c+m} \preceq V_{t_1-}^c$.

Case 2: $i^{c+m} - m < i^c$. Note that the following relations hold between V_{t_1-} and V_{t_1}:

$$V^c_{t_1}(k) = \begin{cases} V^c_{t_1-}(k+1) & k = i^{c+m}-m, \ldots, i^c - 1 \\ V^c_{t_1-}(1) + S & k = i^c \end{cases}$$

$$\text{and} \quad V^{c+m}_{t_1}(k+m) = \begin{cases} V^{c+m}_{t_1-}(1) + S & k = i^{c+m} - m \\ V^{c+m}_{t_1-}(k+m) & k = i^{c+m}-m+1, \ldots, i^c\,. \end{cases}$$

For $k = i^{c+m} - m, \ldots, i^c - 1$ it follows that

$$V^{c+m}_{t_1}(k+m) \le V^{c+m}_{t_1}(k+m+1) = V^{c+m}_{t_1-}(k+m+1) \le V^c_{t_1-}(k+1) = V^c_{t_1}(k)\,.$$

The proof is completed by observing that when $k = i^c$,

$$V^{c+m}_{t_1}(k+m) = V^{c+m}_{t_1-}(i^c+m) \le V^c_{t_1-}(i^c) = V^c_{t_1}(i^c-1) \le V^c_{t_1}(i^c)\,. \qquad \square$$

3.2 Coalescence

Suppose once again that we have used Algorithm 2 to obtain a single perfect sample from the $M/G/c$ queue: this yields a backoff time $T < 0$ and a sequence of arrival times and associated service durations such that the sandwiching processes U^c and L^c coalesce over $[T, 0]$. Define D^c to be the non-negative vector-valued process given by the coordinate-wise difference between U^c and L^c:

$$D^c_t = U^c_t - L^c_t\,, \quad T \le t \le 0\,.$$

Let T^c be the coalescence time for this realisation:

$$T^c = \inf\{t > T \,:\, D^c_t = 0\} < 0\,.$$

We shall write $|L^c_t|$ for the number of customers in L^c_t, and $\mathcal{A}^c_t$ for the set of coordinates where U^c_t and L^c_t *agree*:

$$\mathcal{A}^c_t = \{k \,:\, D^c_t(k) = 0,\, 1 \le k \le c\}\,.$$

We are interested in the question of whether coalescence of U^c and L^c implies coalescence of U^{c+m} and L^{c+m} (instantiated at time T as described in Section 2) over the same period. The following example shows that this is *not* guaranteed.

Example 4. Consider sandwiching processes for two and three server systems (i.e. $c = 2$ and $m = 1$), as described above. Suppose that U^2 and U^3 are both initiated at time 0 with a single service duration of length 1, and that these queues proceed to see arrival times/services (t, S) as follows: $(0.1, 1.2)$, $(0.3, 1.8)$, $(0.8, 5)$. The evolution of these processes viewed at arrival times is as follows:

	$t_0 = 0$	$t_1 = 0.1$	$t_2 = 0.3$	$t_3 = 0.8$
U^2	(0.0, 1.0)	(0.9, 1.2)	(1.0, 2.5)	(2.0, 5.5)
L^2	(0.0, 0.0)	(0.0, 1.2)	(1.0, 1.8)	(1.3, 5.5)

If there are no further arrivals within the next two units of time, we see that U^2 and L^2 will coalesce at time $T^2 = 2.8$ (since it will take two more units of time for their first coordinates to agree, and their second coordinates are already matched).

However, feeding the same sequence of arrival times/services to U^3 and L^3, we see that they will *not* coalesce before time T^2:

	$t_0 = 0$	$t_1 = 0.1$	$t_2 = 0.3$	$t_3 = 0.8$
U^3	(0.0, 0.0, 1.0)	(0.0, 0.9, 1.2)	(0.7, 1.0, 1.8)	(0.5, 1.3, 5.2)
L^3	(0.0, 0.0, 0.0)	(0.0, 0.0, 1.2)	(0.0, 1.0, 1.8)	(0.5, 1.3, 5.0)

Furthermore, if we were to consider sandwiching processes for a four-server system, these *would* coalesce by time T^2 using the above sequence of arrivals:

	$t_0 = 0$	$t_1 = 0.1$	$t_2 = 0.3$	$t_3 = 0.8$
U^4	(0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 1.0)	(0.0, 0.0, 0.9, 1.2)	(0.0, 0.7, 1.0, 1.8)	(0.2, 0.5, 1.3, 5.0)
L^4	(0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0)	(0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 1.2)	(0.0, 0.0, 1.0, 1.8)	(0.0, 0.5, 1.3, 5.0)

A simple, and intuitively obvious, condition which guarantees that the sandwiching processes L^{c+m} and U^{c+m} *will* coalesce by time T^c is that no customer arriving at the lower process L^c during the period $[T, T^c]$ has to wait to commence service:

Proposition 5. *If $|L_t^c| \leq c$ for all $t \in [T, T^c]$ then $D_{T^c}^{c+m} = 0$ (and so $T^{c+m} \leq T^c$) for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. Since L^{c+m} is started from empty, the condition implies that its first m coordinates are identically zero over $[T, T^c]$. Moreover, coalescence of U^c and L^c implies that there must exist an empty server in both of these processes at time T^c (see Connor and Kendall (2015)); i.e. $U_{T^c}^c(1) = L_{T^c}^c(1) = 0$. Since $U_T^{c+m} \preceq U_T^c$, Proposition 3 ensures that $U_{T^c}^{c+m} \preceq U_{T^c}^c$, and so the first m coordinates of $U_{T^c}^{c+m}$ (and of $L_{T^c}^{c+m}$) must also be equal to zero.

It remains to show that the last c coordinates of $U_{T^c}^{c+m}$ and $L_{T^c}^{c+m}$ agree. Since no server in L^c ever has more than one customer to deal with at any moment, the same is true for L^{c+m}, and so $L_t^{c+m}(k+m) = L_t^c(k)$ for all $1 \leq k \leq c$ and for all $t \in [T, T^c]$. Then by the domination established in Proposition 3, and the fact that $U_{T^c}^c = L_{T^c}^c$,

$$U_{T^c}^{c+m}(k+m) \leq U_{T^c}^c(k) = L_{T^c}^c(k) = L_{T^c}^{c+m}(k+m)\,,$$

for all $1 \leq k \leq c$, as required. □

The condition of Proposition 5 is rather strong, and can in fact be weakened, as we now show.

Theorem 6. *Suppose that, for all arrival times $\tau \in [T, T^c]$, if $D_{\tau-}^c(1) = 0$ (equivalently, $1 \in \mathcal{A}_{\tau-}^c$) then $U_{\tau-}^c(1) = 0$. Then $T^{c+m} \leq T^c$ for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Remark 7. The condition of Proposition 5 is stronger than that of Theorem 6. To see this, suppose that $|L_t^c| \leq c$ for all $t \in [T, T^c]$. If at some arrival time $\tau \in [T, T^c]$ we have $D_{\tau-}^c(1) = 0$ but $U_{\tau-}^c(1) > 0$, then there must be at least c customers in $L_{\tau-}^c$ (since $L_{\tau-}^c(1) = U_{\tau-}^c(1) > 0$). But then the customer arriving at time τ would force $|L_\tau^c| = c + 1$, which would break our initial assumption. Therefore if $D_{\tau-}^c(1) = 0$ it must be the case that $U_{\tau-}^c(1) = 0$.

Note that in Example 4 the condition of Proposition 5 clearly fails, and so therefore does the condition of Theorem 6. (In fact $U_{t_3-}^2(1) = L_{t_3-}^2(1) > 0$.)

The key to proving Theorem 6 is to consider the time until coalescence of the sandwiching processes U^c and L^c when viewed at time t, under the assumption of there being *no further*

arrivals in (t, ∞). Note that this is just the time taken for U^c to clear all work in coordinates which disagree with those in L^c at time t. Let us write C_t^c for this quantity:

$$C_t^c = \max_{k \notin \mathcal{A}_t^c} U_t^c(k) = U_t^c(n_t^c)\,, \tag{2}$$

where we define $n_t^c = \max\{1 \le k \le c \,:\, k \notin \mathcal{A}_t^c\}$.

It is clear that C_t^c decreases deterministically at unit rate until it either hits zero (at which point L^c and U^c coalesce) or a new customer arrives. Consider then what happens to C^c if there is an arrival at time τ with associated service duration S. Let k_U and k_L be the coordinates satisfying $U_\tau^c(k_U) = U_{\tau-}^c(1) + S$ and $L_\tau^c(k_L) = L_{\tau-}^c(1) + S$. (That is, the arriving job gets allocated to the server with the least work in each of $U_{\tau-}^c$ and $L_{\tau-}^c$, and then when the workload vectors are reordered this job finds itself in position k_U in U_τ^c and k_L in L_τ^c.) To be explicit

$$k_U = \min\{k \,:\, U_{\tau-}^c(1) + S \le U_{\tau-}^c(k+1)\,, 1 \le k < c\}\,,$$

with $k_U = c$ if the minimum above is taken over the empty set. Note that this convention – that the new job is placed at the lowest coordinate possible, after reordering, in U_τ^c – allows us to deal with the possibility that $U_{\tau-}^c(1) + S = U_{\tau-}^c(k+1)$ for some $1 \le k < c$, i.e. of U_τ^c containing two equal but non-zero coordinates; when arrivals are Poisson this possibility occurs with probability zero, of course. In particular, this implies that

$$U_\tau^c(k_U) > U_{\tau-}^c(k_U)\,. \tag{3}$$

There are two cases to consider when assessing the impact of an arrival on C^c, depending on whether or not the servers with least workload in $U_{\tau-}^c$ and $L_{\tau-}^c$ are in agreement.

Case 1: $1 \in \mathcal{A}_{\tau-}^c$

(i) Suppose first that $k_U \ge n_{\tau-}^c$. Since $U_{\tau-}^c(k) = L_{\tau-}^c(k)$ for all $k > n_{\tau-}^c$, it must be the case that $k_L = k_U \in \mathcal{A}_\tau^c$. So $n_\tau^c = n_{\tau-}^c - 1$ and $C_\tau^c = U_\tau^c(n_\tau^c) = U_{\tau-}^c(n_{\tau-}^c) = C_{\tau-}^c$.

(ii) Alternatively, if $k_U < n_{\tau-}^c$ then $n_\tau^c = n_{\tau-}^c$, and so $C_\tau^c = C_{\tau-}^c$ once again.

Thus there is no change to C^c if the arriving customer finds $U_{\tau-}^c(1) = L_{\tau-}^c(1)$.

Case 2: $1 \notin \mathcal{A}_{\tau-}^c$

(i) Suppose that $k_U \ge n_{\tau-}^c$. Since $U_{\tau-}^c(k) = L_{\tau-}^c(k)$ for all $k > n_{\tau-}^c$, it must be the case that $k_L \le k_U$. We claim that $k_U \notin \mathcal{A}_\tau^c$, and so $n_\tau^c = k_U$; it then follows that $C_\tau^c = U_\tau^c(n_\tau^c) = U_\tau^c(k_U) = U_{\tau-}^c(1) + S > C_{\tau-}^c$.
To see that $n_\tau^c = k_U$, we need to show that $L_\tau^c(k_U) < U_\tau^c(k_U)$. Notice that

$$L_\tau^c(k_U) = \max\{L_{\tau-}^c(k_U),\, L_{\tau-}^c(1) + S\} \quad \text{and} \quad U_\tau^c(k_U) = U_{\tau-}^c(1) + S\,.$$

Clearly $L_{\tau-}^c(1) + S < U_{\tau-}^c(1) + S$ (since $1 \notin \mathcal{A}_{\tau-}^c$). Furthermore, $L_{\tau-}^c(k_U) \le U_{\tau-}^c(k_U) < U_\tau^c(k_U)$ thanks to (3).

(ii) Alternatively, if $k_U < n_{\tau-}^c$ then $k_L \le n_{\tau-}^c$ also, and so $n_\tau^c = n_{\tau-}^c$. Thus $C_\tau^c = C_{\tau-}^c$.

Thus when $1 \notin \mathcal{A}_{\tau-}^c$, $C_\tau^c = \max\{U_{\tau-}^c(n_{\tau-}^c),\, U_{\tau-}^c(1) + S\}$.

In summary, we see that the time to coalescence of L^c and U^c increases exactly when there is an arrival at time τ, with $1 \notin \mathcal{A}^c_{\tau-}$ and $k_U \geq n^c_{\tau-}$. That is,

$$C^c_\tau = \begin{cases} C^c_{\tau-} & \text{if } 1 \in \mathcal{A}^c_{\tau-} \\ \max\{C^c_{\tau-},\, U^c_{\tau-}(1) + S\} & \text{if } 1 \notin \mathcal{A}^c_{\tau-}\,. \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

The next result is key to the proof of Theorem 6: it shows that, under the same assumption as the theorem, the time to coalescence with $c+m$ servers is dominated by the time to coalescence with c servers.

Lemma 8. *Suppose that at arrival time τ, if $1 \in \mathcal{A}^c_{\tau-}$ then $U^c_{\tau-}(1) = 0$. Suppose also that $C^{c+m}_{\tau-} \leq C^c_{\tau-}$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $C^{c+m}_\tau \leq C^c_\tau$.*

Proof. We consider the two possible scenarios seen by the customer arriving at time τ.

1. $1 \in \mathcal{A}^{c+m}_{\tau-}$.
2. $1 \notin \mathcal{A}^{c+m}_{\tau-}$ and $1 \notin \mathcal{A}^c_{\tau-}$.

(Note that the third possibility, that $1 \notin \mathcal{A}^{c+m}_{\tau-}$ and $1 \in \mathcal{A}^c_{\tau-}$, is excluded by our assumption. Indeed, if $1 \in \mathcal{A}^c_{\tau-}$ then our assumption would force $L^c_{\tau-}(1) = U^c_{\tau-}(1) = 0$. So the arrival at time τ would find a server empty in U^c, which would mean that it must also find a server empty in U^{c+m}. But that would imply that $1 \in \mathcal{A}^{c+m}_{\tau-}$.)

Let's treat these two possibilities in order.

1. Since $1 \in \mathcal{A}^{c+m}_{t-}$, we know from (4) that the coalescence time for L^{c+m} and U^{c+m} is unchanged by the new arrival. In addition, the coalescence time for L^c and U^c cannot decrease due to this arrival. So
$$C^{c+m}_\tau = C^{c+m}_{\tau-} \leq C^c_{\tau-} \leq C^c_\tau\,.$$
2. Here the arrival potentially affects the time-to-coalescence of both pairs of sandwiching processes. However,
$$C^{c+m}_\tau = \max\{C^{c+m}_{\tau-},\, U^{c+m}_{\tau-}(1) + S\} \leq \max\{C^c_{\tau-},\, U^c_{\tau-}(1) + S\} = C^c_\tau\,,$$
where the inequality follows from the second assumption of the Lemma, and the previously established fact that $U^{c+m}_{\tau-} \preceq U^c_{\tau-}$.

□

We can now complete the proof of Theorem 6. Recall that the sandwiching processes L^{c+m} and U^{c+m} are started at time $T < 0$ with L^{c+m}_T empty and U^{c+m}_T instantiated using the same set of residual workloads that are present in U^c_T. Now, it is clear that departures in U^{c+m} occur no later than in U^c, and since C^c_T is simply the time taken for all customers present in U^c_T to depart it follows that

$$C^{c+m}_T \leq C^c_T\,.$$

Given that the assumption of Theorem 6 holds, Lemma 8 tells us that this ordering is preserved for all $t \in [T, T^c]$:

$$C^{c+m}_t \leq C^c_t\,, \quad t \in [T, T^c]\,.$$

But since L^c and U^c coalesce at time $T^c < 0$, we see that $C^{c+m}_{T^c} = C^c_{T^c} = 0$, and so $T^{c+m} \leq T^c$, as claimed.

4 Simulations

The result of Theorem 6 provides us with a recipe for performing omnithermal perfect simulation for $M/G/(c+m)$ queues, for $m = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$.

Omnithermal Algorithm

1. Use Algorithm 2 of Connor and Kendall (2015) to establish a backoff time $T < 0$ and upper and lower sandwiching processes U^c and L^c over $[T, 0]$ such that $U_0^c = L_0^c$:
   (i) Calculate the coalescence time $T^c \in [T, 0]$ of U^c and L^c, and check to see whether the condition of Theorem 6 is satisfied for all arrival times in $[T, T^c]$;
   (ii) While the condition is *not* satisfied, set $T \leftarrow 2T$, and use Algorithm 2 of Connor and Kendall (2015) to extend the simulation of the sandwiching processes over the new window $[T, 0]$.
2. For each required $m \in \mathbb{N}$, construct L^{c+m} over $[T, 0]$, using the same sequence of arrival times and services as in the construction of L^c. Return L_0^{c+m} as a perfect equilibrium draw of the Kiefer-Wolfowitz vector for the $M/G/(c+m)$ queue of interest. (Note that there is no need to also construct U^{c+m}: Theorem 6 guarantees that $U_0^{c+m} = L_0^{c+m}$.)

Remark 9. If we are called upon to use part 1(ii) of the algorithm and extend the simulations of U^c and L^c further into the past, we are guaranteed that these new sandwiching processes ($\tilde{U}^c$ and $\tilde{L}^c$, say) will still coalesce by time T^c: this follows from Theorem 5.1 of Connor and Kendall (2015), which implies that

$$L_t^c \preceq \tilde{L}_t^c \preceq \tilde{U}_t^c \preceq U_t^c, \quad t \in [T, 0]\,.$$

We applied the Omnithermal Algorithm to the three sets of simulations presented in Figure 4 of Connor and Kendall (2015); these all concern $M/M/c$ queues with $\lambda = c$ and $\mu = 2$. 5,000 runs were performed for each set of parameters ($\lambda = 10$, 30, 50): for each run we recorded the original backoff time T (required for coalescence of U^c and L^c), and the number of times that this was doubled in part 1(ii) in order to satisfy the condition of Theorem 6. When $\lambda = 30$ (respectively 50) we found that only 4 (respectively 0) of the original backoff times needed to be extended; when $\lambda = 10$ this number rose to 108 (2.1% of the sample). Furthermore, those runs which needed extending did not require T to be doubled a significant number of times: no run required us to double T more than three times, with most of the runs requiring only a single additional backoff in order to satisfy the condition of Theorem 6 – see Figure 1.

In addition, we used the Omnithermal Algorithm to investigate the effect of changing server number for an $M/M/c$ queue with arrival rate $\lambda = 1.2$, service rate $\mu = 1$ and number of servers $c \in \{2, 3, 4\}$. We ran the algorithm 5,000 times, for which 94 runs failed the condition of Theorem 6 and needed extending further into the past. Figure 2 shows the mean value of each coordinate of the Kiefer-Wolfowitz workload vector from this sample. The effect on the value of the first coordinate (which represents the mean waiting time of a customer arriving in equilibrium) of increasing the number of servers from two to three can be seen to be substantial: the mean value drops from 0.57 to just 0.08. Further detail is provided in Figure 3, where we show the effect on the distribution function of the remaining workload at the first two coordinates of the workload vectors for the same set of simulations.



Figure 1: Simulation results for 5,000 runs of the Omnithermal Algorithm for an $M/M/c$ queue with $\lambda = c = 10$ and $\mu = 2$. 108 runs failed the condition of Theorem 6 and needed extending further into the past; the figure shows the number of times each of these 108 runs needed to be extended (using the usual binary backoff scheme). No run needed to be extended more than three times.

5 Concluding comments

We have shown how the efficient Algorithm 2 of Connor and Kendall (2015) for $M/G/c$ queues may be modified to allow for omnithermal perfect simulation; our new algorithm uses a simple test to determine whether or not the dominating process used for the c-server algorithm needs to be extended further into the past in order to allow for simultaneous sampling from $M/G/(c+m)$ queues for any desired $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Furthermore, we have provided numerical evidence which suggests that, at least in the case of moderate traffic intensity, the Omnithermal Algorithm requires minimal additional computational expense.

We conclude by noting two extensions of our algorithm. Our first observation is that the coalescence arguments underpinning Section 3 do not rely in any way on the distribution of inter-arrival times. As noted in the introduction, Blanchet et al. (2015) have recently shown how to implement domCFTP for $GI/GI/c$ queues using a random assignment dominating



Figure 2: Mean of each coordinate of the workload vector for an $M/M/c$ queue with $\lambda = 1.2$, $\mu = 1$ and $c \in \{2, 3, 4\}$. (Results from 5,000 runs of the Omnithermal Algorithm.)



Figure 3: Distribution functions for workload at first (left) and second (right) coordinates of the workload vector, for the set of simulations presented in Figure 2.

process with upper and lower sandwiching processes in the style of Algorithm 2 above. It is therefore possible to perform omnithermal simulation for these queues, by using their algorithm in place of Algorithm 2 in step 1 of the Omnithermal Algorithm.

The second natural extension is to omnithermal simulation of queues which are more stable than the $M/G/c$ on account of having shorter service durations, but the same number of servers. (We could equivalently consider queues with longer inter-arrival times of course; however, for the domination arguments of Section 3 to hold it is essential that the two systems being compared have the same set of arrival times. It is therefore more convenient to adjust the service durations instead.) Suppose that service times in the more stable system are distributed as βS for some $\beta \in (0, 1]$: this is equivalent to the service times being distributed as S, but with each server now completing work at rate $\beta^{-1} \geq 1$. So we can compare the two systems as in Section 3, feeding both the same sets of arrival times and service durations, but with the time-to-coalescence in (2) replaced by

$$C_t^\beta = \beta U_t^\beta(n_t^\beta)$$

(where we have once again used the superscript to indicate the parameter that varies between the queues under consideration).

In a similar manner to Example 4, it is easy to conjure up a set of arrival times and service durations such that the system completing work at rate β^{-1} has $C_t^\beta > C_t^1$ for some values of t. However, we note that in this new setting equation (4) becomes

$$C_\tau^\beta = \begin{cases} C_{\tau-}^\beta & \text{if } 1 \in \mathcal{A}_{\tau-}^\beta \\ \max\{C_{\tau-}^\beta,\, \beta(U_{\tau-}^\beta(1) + S)\} & \text{if } 1 \notin \mathcal{A}_{\tau-}^\beta \,. \end{cases}$$

Using this, it is a simple exercise to check that if the condition of Theorem 6 is satisfied, then the sandwiching processes for the faster-working system will coalesce no later than do U^c and L^c for the original $M/G/c$ queue. In other words, we can perform omnithermal simulation in this setting by simply replacing step 2 of the Omnithermal Algorithm with the following variant:

2′. For each required $\beta \in (0, 1)$, construct L^β over $[T, 0]$, using the same set of arrival times and services as in the construction of L^c. Return L_0^β as a perfect equilibrium draw of the Kiefer-Wolfowitz vector for the $M/G/c$ queue, in which work is completed at rate β^{-1}.

(Step 1 – in which we possibly extend some simulations further into the past – does not change at all.)

In conclusion, omnithermal perfect simulation for multi-server queues under FCFS allocation may be performed in a practical and efficient manner; moreover, once we have done the work of extending any runs of the dominating process further into the past, the resulting simulations may be used to produce perfect samples when either the number of servers or the rate at which work is performed is increased.

References

Blanchet, J. and X. Chen (2016). Perfect Sampling of Generalized Jackson Network. *arXiv 1601.05499*.

Blanchet, J., J. Dong, and Y. Pei (2015). Perfect Sampling of $GI/GI/c$ Queues. *arXiv 1508.02262*.

Blanchet, J., Y. Pei, and K. Sigman (2015). Exact sampling for some multi-dimensional queueing models with renewal input. *arXiv 1512.07284*.

Connor, S. B. and W. S. Kendall (2015). Perfect simulation of $M/G/c$ queues. *Advances in Applied Probability 47*(4), 1039–1063.

Grimmett, G. (1995). The stochastic random-cluster process and the uniqueness of random-cluster measures. *The Annals of Probability 23*(4), 1461–1510.

Kiefer, J. and J. Wolfowitz (1955). On the theory of queues with many servers. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society 18*(1), 1–18.

Propp, J. G. and D. B. Wilson (1996). Exact sampling with coupled Markov chains and applications to statistical mechanics. *Random Structures and Algorithms 9*, 223–252.

Sigman, K. (2011). Exact Simulation of the Stationary Distribution of the FIFO $M/G/c$ Queue. *Journal of Applied Probability 48A*, 209–213.